DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 305 923 IR 013 783

AUTHOR Davis, Lloyd
TITLE UTC Word Processing Services and Center Evaluation and Recommendations.
INSTITUTION Tennessee Univ., Chattanooga.
PUB DATE 1 May 88
NOTE 50p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrators; *College Faculty; Higher Education; *Microcomputers; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Surveys; *Use Studies; *Word Processing
IDENTIFIERS Computer Centers

ABSTRACT

This study evaluated the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga's Word Processing Center by surveying faculty and administrative use of word processing and personal computers. Questionnaires were sent to all faculty and academic and administrative departments, and 130 responses were received from faculty, 33 from academic departments, and 47 from administrative departments. The data indicate that at least 120 faculty had access to personal computers, and that there were 116 personal computers in academic departments and 95 in administrative departments. The dominant faculty software packages were MacWrite and Microsoft Word for the MacIntosh and Multimate and Word Perfect for the IBM PC. For the academic departments the prominent software packages were MacWrite, Microsoft World, and Multimate. Among the administrative departments there was little use of the MacIntosh, and among the IBM PC users the primary package was Multimate. The top priority of the Word Processing Center was grant proposals, and it appeared that there were few problems, if any, with the faculty over the established and publicized priorities. The Center now uses the HP3000 and software TDP (Text and Document Processor). However, this software is not very user friendly, and it is suggested that a major portion of the faculty would be aided significantly by the center's ability to utilize microcomputers in their work in support of the faculty. Eight recommendations are provided, including purchase of microcomputers, standardization of word processing software, and the introduction of some new services. The text is supplemented by 37 tables, and appendixes provide supporting documents and copies of the survey instruments. (EW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED305923

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

UTC WORD PROCESSING SERVICES AND CENTER EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

by
LLOYD DAVIS
University of Tennessee
at Chattanooga

May 1, 1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Lloyd Davis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR013783

INTRODUCTION

On December 11, 1987 Dr. Richard Gray requested me to conduct an evaluation of UTC's Word Processing Center. The evaluation should cover those points identified in John White's letter of December 8, (see Appendices A.1 and A.2) as well as several raised by Dr. Gray.

Objectives

From John White, the following objectives a, b, and c were suggested, and from Richard Gray objectives d and e:

a) Identify what kinds and numbers of personal computers are on campus.

b) Identify computer hardware and software which can be compatible to and accessed by most faculty computers.

c) Prepare a list of equipment and/or software which will increase the effectiveness of the Word Processing Center.

d) Assess Center's Operating Guidelines.

e) Make recommendations on Center's reliance on mainframe software support, the range and priority of support services provided, and the exclusion of administrative user support services.

METHODOLOGY

During the Spring Semester of 1987-88 questionnaires were designed and distributed to all UTC faculty, academic departments, and administrative departments. Each questionnaire type was somewhat individualized to reflect both the types of word processing expected from the respondent and as well to attempt to measure that individual's or unit's future needs for word processing. (See Appendices B.1, B.2, and B.3.)

These survey forms were tabulated by SPSS-X on the HP 3000 using both the Frequency and Cross Tabulations Procedures. Where possible, responses were aggregated by unit (such as College of Arts and Sciences and School of Engineering). However, in a number of cases, we could not identify the responding unit, as that response was missing. Further, on a few questions the requested response was not present; hence, those data could not be coded. This may cause some cross tabulated issues to appear to have more missing responses than at first seems likely. Telephone calls were made to academic and administrative department heads who appeared not to have completed the questionnaires. This process resulted in a few additional completed surveys. These were included in the analysis.

Interviews were held by the researcher with both John White and Connie Looney so as to determine their perceptions and aspirations on the issues to be researched. Guidelines in use currently by the Word Processing Center were examined (see Appendix C.1). Further, the Monthly Reports on Word Processing Center's activities were reviewed for the months of February and March (see Appendix C.2 and C.3), and for years 1981-87 (see Appendix C.4).

The format of the remainder of this report consists of the Analysis, Findings, and Conclusions.

ANALYSIS - Faculty

Respondents totaled 130 faculty members, of which 100 had valid department code responses. Valid departments were distributed in the amounts 56%, 10%, 15%, 8%, and 11% for Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, Engineering, Human Services, and Education units respectively. The complete distribution is in Table 1.

Of those responding, 120 have a micro computer for their personal use. When missing data is ignored, this amounts to 93% of the faculty completing the questionnaires (see Table 2). For future considerations, percentages will represent those frequencies with missing values ignored. Of these 120 who have access to personal computers the Macintosh, with 60%, and the IBM PC, with 26%, were dominant (see Table 3). When analyzed by academic unit (see Table 4), 43 of 60 Macintoshes were in Arts and Sciences and 9 were in Education. For IBM PCs, 9 and 7 of 21 were in Engineering and Business Administration respectively. It should be noted that thirty respondents could not be identified by academic unit.

About 95% of the respondents use a micro for word processing as reported in Table 5. Further, from Table 6, we see that MacWrite, Microsoft Word, Word Perfect and Multimate account for about 78% of the software word processing packages. From Table 7, where data are analyzed by micro type, we see that all the MacWrite and most of Microsoft Word is found on Macintosh and, similarly, all of Word Perfect and Multimate is found on the IBM. From Table 8, we see that faculty members of Arts and Sciences are very heavy users of MacWrite and Microsoft Word. Business Administration faculty members are heavy users of Word Perfect and Multimate; Engineering reported primarily Word Perfect usage with some MacWrite.

From Tables 9 and 10, we see that for faculty, the primary use of word processing within the area of instruction is for producing exams, with syllabi and course assignments not far behind. For faculty use of word processors in support of non-instructional matters, the primary use was for research papers, followed by departmental

reports and proposals. From Table 11, where data are analyzed by micro type, we see heaviest usage of the IBM PC in preparing research papers followed by course assignments, syllabi, and exams. From the data on Macintoshes we see a reverse pattern where exams, syllabi, research papers, and course assignments are the primary ones in descending order. The data appears to report that IBM PCs are primarily used for research and the Macintosh primarily for instruction.

From Tables 12 and 13, we see 11 faculty, or 9%, report heavy to moderate usage of UTC's Word Processing Center. Another 27 report usage to be seldom. This indicates 30% of the faculty make some use of the Center. Further 10 faculty, or 8%, make moderate to heavy use of TDP, the mainframe software package. When combined with users who report seldom usage, 22% of the faculty make some use of TDP themselves.

New word processing services desired by faculty were requested by 26 of the faculty. Of these, 11 requested more access to laser printers; four each wanted more extensive courses and graphics; faculty support and proficient technical typists were requested by 3 and 2 faculty respectively.

ANALYSIS - Academic Departments

Thirty-three (33) academic departments responded to the questionnaire appropriate to their areas (see Table 14). As you can determine from Table 15, a good cross section of those units was obtained, but 7 were anonymous.

From Tables 16 and 17, 33 departments reported using microcomputers and the use of word processing software on those micros. Two (2) departments did not use microcomputers. Table 18 reported on the numbers and types of micros. Obviously since there are a total of 44 responses from 33 departments, some departments had more than one type. Of these 33 departments 20 had Macintoshes, 11 had IBM PCs, 6 had Apple IIes, 4 had HP 150s and 3 had other. When analyzed by type of micro computer, the bulk of Macintoshes appeared in the College of Arts and Sciences, with only 1 or 2 in Engineering, Health and Human Services, and Education (see Table 19). Business Administration reported none. However, as seen in Table 20, Business Administration reported 3 departments using the IBM PC with Health and Human Services reporting 2 departments and Arts and Sciences, Engineering, and Education one IBM PC using department each.

When the primary word processing software for micros, used by academic department, was examined in Table 21, the three most used in descending order were MacWrite, Multimate, and Microsoft Word. The three packages second most used were Microsoft Word, MacWrite, and Apple Writer. Realizing that micro type influenced this

greatly, software was examined by Macintosh and IBM PC. For Macintosh, 10 departments used MacWrite most and 5 used Microsoft Word. For IBM, Multimate was the only strong response with 4 departments reporting its use (Table 22).

Table 23 reported that 10 departments, or 28%, made heavy to moderate use of word processing services. Another 15 reported seldom or never as to the use of their services. Hence, nearly 72% of departments report some use of Word Processing Center services. When the use of TDP by academic departments was examined in Table 24, 9 departments, or 26%, report heavy to moderate use of TDP. Another 10 departments report TDP usage as seldom or never. Hence, 56% of all departments report some usage of TDP on the HP 3000.

Uses of word processing by academic departments were reported in Table 25. Most frequent usage was for letters, followed by syllabi, exams, and research papers. These data were aggregated in Table 26 to form a weighted ranking of usage. The top four were letters, exams, syllabi, and research papers. Proposals ranked sixth out of ten categories for usage of word processors. When queried about needed new word processing services, the only one requested was PC access to mainframe data base linkage.

ANALYSIS - Administrative Departments

Questionnaires mailed to administrative users resulted in 47 responses. These departments responding are given in Table 27. Of the 47 respondents, 44 departments reported in Table 28 the use of microcomputers and 3 reported no use. Similarly in Table 29, 41 departments reported the use of word processing on their departmental micro computers. Tables 30 and 31 reported eight administrative departments with a Macintosh and 27 with an IBM PC. There are 4 administrative departments in Table 32 with Apple IIes, 7 with HP 150s, and 9 with other types.

The software primarily utilized for word processing is reported in Table 33. It reports the most frequently used packages in order to be Multimate, WordStar, Microsoft Word, and Word Perfect with 10, 8, 6, and 6 responses respectively. When analyzed for PC type in Table 34, the IBM PC leaders were Multimate, WordStar, and Word Perfect with 9, 5, and 4 responses respectively. The Other category (I suspect those to be IBM clones) reported 3 users for Microsoft Word and 1 each for Word Perfect and WordStar. For Macintoshes, the only two reported were MacWrite and Microsoft Word with 2 and 1 responses respectively.

Currently administrative users do not make use of Word Processing Center services. Hence these departments were asked if they would make use of the center if the centers services were available. For administrative users 12, or 27%, reported that they

would make heavy to moderate usage of the Center. Further, 24 and 8 departments, 55% and 18% respectively, reported seldom or never as usage. These data are reported in Table 35.

Similarly, use of TDP on the HP 3000 was reported in Table 36. Administrative users now have access to this product if they can access the Academic Series 58. Of the responding departments 10, or 22%, report their usage to be heavy to moderate. Another 4 and 32 departments, or 9% and 79% respectively, report usage to be seldom or never.

From Table 37, we see that primary and dominant usage made of administrative departmental word processors are letters, reports, and proposals. Much farther back are other items such as tables, newsletters, and charts.

When queried about new services for word processing, 7 respondents from administrative departments suggested items. None were reported by more than one respondent. Those services reported were:

Standardize Micros/Software
Service awareness "?"
Trouble Shooter
On Line Typesetter
Support Staff for Faculty
Laser Printers
Administrative Support

FINDINGS

a. In summary there are at least 120 faculty with access to a personal computer, 116 personal computers in academic departments, and 95 in administrative departments. These latter two groups of computers are distributed among 33 academic departments and 41 administrative departments. Of these 300 plus micros, 131 are Macintoshes, 119 are IBM PCs, and the remainder include HP150s, Apple IIes, and IBM "clones."

b. The dominant faculty software packages are MacWrite and Microsoft Word for the Macintosh and Multimate and Word Perfect for the IBM PCs. For academic departments, MacWrite and Word are again the primary software packages, while for the IBM PC the primary package is Multimate. Among the administrative departments, there was little use of the Macintosh; among the IBM PC users the primary package was Multimate, followed at a distance by Word Star and Word Perfect.

c. Appendix D includes sample Macintosh and IBM PC hardware and software configurations. The better Macintosh configuration (see Appendix D - Point B) with large screen and Laser Printer will cost UTC about $7,600. A reasonable IBM configuration (see Appendix D - Point C)using the existing HP Laser would be about $3,500.

d. The Guidelines of the Word Processing Center quote "The Center exists to serve the **academic area (faculty)** for special word processing needs as an extension of the typing services normally provided by the departmental secretaries." It supports the following categories: "Grant Proposals, Tests, Course Syllabi, Class Handouts, Manuscripts (books, articles, papers, and monographs), and Other (reports, vitae, letters, and surveys)." "Priority order is Grant Proposals, Tests, Course Syllabi, Class Handouts, Manuscripts, and Other."

The Provost has told the researcher that Grant Proposals must be the top priority. Further the unit reports to the Director of Grants and Research in the area of the Associate Provost for Graduate Studies and Research. Hence the focus seems reasonable and supportive of its supervising structure. From discussions with Word Processing Center staff, there seem to be few problems, if any, with the faculty over the established and publicized priorities system. From observation and empirical data on the Center's output, the services offered are reasonable and workable. If added services are taken on, these must be done carefully so as to not undo those currently supported. These areas might include some administrative departmental support and potentially certain spread sheet and graphics services such as charts and overhead transparencies.

f. The Word Processing Center was established in 1981 and has since its inception utilized the HP3000 and software TDP (Text and Document Processor). This software made use of ASCII terminals and hence allowed all public and other terminals to have access to word processing functions. This package is best for long documents and has been superceded for many applications by word processing on personal computers. Reliance on the HP3000 has made archival, backup, and restore functions very easy, dependable, and routine. The HP Operator does most of the work in routine backups. The HP3000 does utilize disk storage; the use by TDP is ever consumptive of this medium. Each year a request for materials to be removed is made by Ms. Looney. Without fail, the storage involved grows each year.

However, a greater problem with TDP is the fact that it is line driven (you work and look at one line at a time) and typists cannot see the effects of their formatting efforts until they run a "final." The TDP is not WYSIWYG, "What you see is what you get." Hence typists must be able to enter their formatting commands and know what such a command will do at final time. This is a degree of abstraction more akin to programming than to secretarial work and many find TDP difficult.

Current micros are very user friendly, employ visual WYSIWYG, include graphical design features, and provide for rapid entry, formatting, review, and revision of documents. The staff of the Center, Ms Cleveland and Ms. Looney have utilized personal computers in the Micro Lab in support of UTC faculty. A major portion of our faculty would be aided significantly by the Center's ability to utilize micros in their work in support of the faculty.Then work done by the Center could be given back to the faculty member on diskette, on which it could be later used and updated on either the personal computer of the faculty member or the Center.

An interesting usage of a computer is the use of say a Macintosh equipped with an external 5.25" drive and appropriate software. Macintosh files can be transferred to this device which writes an IBM compatible diskette. This diskette can be taken to any IBM PC that has a 5.25" disk drive (most of them at this time). The file can be read by the IBM PC and processed whether it is word processing or spread sheet data. At the most advanced level, the systems are compatible, ie. Word on the Macintosh and Word on the PC. At the most difficult level, one writes a file in ASCII from the Macintosh and writes it to a diskette which is carried to an IBM PC and read into its CPU. This file is then formatted quickly and simply by the PC operator. The researcher and the CECA Secretary have used this system well for about one year. There are also programs such as Word Exchange that transfer to and from Word from Multimate, Word Star, and Word perfect to name several. The point is that a Macintosh can now go from most word processors to any other word processor and micro.

With regards to needed or requested services, academic and administrative departments submitted only 1 and 7 responded respectively. In the later group there were two requests that ought to be listed. These are "support staff for faculty" and "administrative support." Among the faculty of 26 requests for new services there were 11 for more laser printers, 3 for more faculty support, and 2 for technical typists. It is the researcher's impression from these comments and the number of units with personal computers and word processors that

there is no major perceived need among academic and administrative departments for more word processing services. Probably those departments are getting done what needs to be done and on a satisfactory time schedule. The need is still at the faculty level since there is insufficient support from departmental secretaries generally to accomplish the course revisions, syllabi, vitae, articles, and books for which faculty members often require support. That is not to say the Word Processing Center cannot do more. For example, in 1987-88 services to support Self Study Reports were offered to both the School of Business Administration and Department of Human Ecology. Only the latter utilized these offered services. In 1981 the Center did the Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance's Budget document. The Center should make more faculty and others aware of this no charge service so as to attract more customers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

a. De-emphasize the HP3000 and TDP and emphasize word processing software on micro computers.

b. Purchase an Apple Macintosh II with Laser at $7,600
Less expensive options are in Appendix D.

Sixty percent of the faculty and half of the departments utilize Macintoshes. Utilizing the appropriate external disk and software allows word processing documents to be transferred easily to the IBM PC.

c. Purchase an IBM PC at $3,200 to be used with HP Laser.

d. Utilize the Macintosh II with external 5.25" drive to output ASCII files that are transferable to IBM PC. These files may be converted with an exchange program, such as listed in Appendix D, when formatting is to be carried from one software package or computer to a different type.

e. Standardize on Multimate or Word Perfect for IBM users and MacWrite and Microsoft Word for Macintosh users.

f. Occasionally departments will have work that is high volume, large amounts of input, or very specialized. These non-routine tasks should be fitted into the Word

Processing Center's schedule.This includes academic and administrative departments. It is particularly important not to upset known standards until the volume of new requests, if any, can be determined.

g. With micro based software for word processing offer new or improved services such as questionnaire design, data entry for spread sheets along with simple row and column totals, simple graphics and overhead transparency production.

Note: It is the researcher's perception, supported by data from all questionnaires that the Word Processing Center is doing a very good job with the equipment and software they have. No one criticized them when asked "what new word processing services were needed?" immediately after questioning them as to use of the Center and TDP. In fact, because of the questionnaire, some called CECA to inquire as to whether services were being discontinued and to protest if they were.

TABLES

TABLE 1

FACULTY RESPONDENTS TO WORD PROCESSING SURVEY
BY DEPARTMENTAL AFFILIATION

Department	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Art	3	2.3	3.0
Biology	5	3.8	5.0
Chemistry	4	3.1	4.0
Communications	1	.8	1.0
English	10	7.7	10.0
Environmental Studies	1	.8	1.0
History	1	.8	1.0
Mathematics	10	7.7	10.0
Music	2	1.5	2.0
Philosophy & Religion	2	1.5	2.0
Physics	3	2.3	3.0
Political Science	1	.8	1.0
Psychology	4	3.1	4.0
Sociology & Anthropology	7	5.4	7.0
Theatre & Speech	2	1.5	2.0
			56.0
Accounting	1	.8	1.0
Management	4	3.1	4.0
Marketing	2	1.5	2.0
Economics	3	2.3	3.0
			10.0
Engineering	9	6.9	9.0
Computer Science	6	4.6	6.0
			15.0
Criminal Justice	2	1.5	2.0
Human Services	3	2.3	3.0
Nursing	3	2.3	3.0
			8.0
Administration & Supervision	2	1.5	2.0
Curriculum & Instruction	3	2.3	3.0
Special Ed & Ed Psychology	4	3.1	4.0
Health, P.E. & Recreation	2	1.5	2.0
			11.0
Missing Department Code	30	23.1	--
	130	100.0	100.0

TABLE 2

HAVE MICRO COMPUTER FOR PERSONAL USE
BY FACULTY

Response	Frequency	Percent
YES	120	93
NO	9	7
	129	100

TABLE 3

THE PERSONAL COMPUTER PRIMARILY USED
BY FACULTY

Response	Frequency	Percent
MacIntosh	72	60.0
IBM PC	31	25.8
Apple IIe	3	2.5
HP 150	1	.8
Other	13	10.8
	120	100.0

TABLE 4

PERSONAL COMPUTER PERSONALLY USED
BY SCHOOL OR COLLEGE* OF FACULTY MEMBER

	Macintosh	IBM PC	Other	Total
Arts & Sciences	43	3	8	54
Business Admin.	--	7	3	10
Engineering	2	9	4	15
Health & Hum.Serv.	6	1	--	7
Education	9	1	1	11
Total	60	21	16	97

* 33 respondents could not be classified

TABLE 5

DO WORD PROCESSING ON A PERSONAL COMPUTER
BY FACULTY

Response	Frequency	Percent
YES	122	94.6
NO	7	5.4
	129	100.0

TABLE 6

SOFTWARE PRIMARILY USED FOR
WORD PROCESSING BY FACULTY

Response	Frequency	Percent
MacWrite	56	45.9
Microsoft Word	16	13.1
Word Perfect	10	8.2
Multimate	13	10.7
Microsoft Works	2	1.6
Word Star	5	4.1
Apple Writer	2	1.6
Display Write	1	.8
Other	17	13.9
	122	100.0

TABLE 7

SOFTWARE PRIMARILY USED BY COMPUTER
FOR WORD PROCESSING BY FACULTY NUMBERS

Response	MacIntosh	IBM PC	Other
MacWrite	56	--	--
Microsoft Word	13	1	2
Microsoft Works	2	--	--
Word Perfect	--	8	2
Multimate	--	12	1
Word Star	--	3	2
Display Write	--	1	--
Apple Writer	--	--	2
Other	1	5	11
	72	30	20

TABLE 8

WORD PROCESSING SOFTWARE PRIMARILY USED BY
COLLEGE OR SCHOOL OF FACULTY MEMBER

	MacWrite	Microsoft Word	Word Perfect MultiMate	Other
Arts & Sciences	34	9	1/1	9
Business Admin.	--	--	2/6	2
Engineering	2	--	5/0	8
Health & Hum. Serv.	4	1	-/1	1
Education	6	2	--	2
	46	12	8/8	22

TABLE 9

USES MADE BY RANK OF WORD PROCESSORS
BY FACULTY

	Most Used	2nd Most Used	3rd Most Used	4th Most Used	5th Most Used
Exams	23	20	20	7	12
Course Asnmts.	13	17	13	5	2
Lecture Notes	12	7	5	2	4
Syllabi	12	16	18	17	7
Research Papers	22	18	14	7	6
Proposals	4	10	7	13	15
Books	8	3	2	1	3
Dept. Reports	14	5	8	12	6
Other	6	4	5	3	3
	114	100	92	67	58

TABLE 10

USES MADE BY WEIGHTED RANKINGS* OF
WORD PROCESSORS USED BY FACULTY MEMBERS

	Weighted Rank
Exams	523
Syllabi	396
Course Assignments	348
Lecture Notes	211
Research Papers	461
Department Reports	262
Proposals	209
Books	120
Other	129

*Weighted Ranks constructed by awarding 10, 8, 5, 3, and 1 points to Most Used, Next Most Used, . . ., 5th Most Used and summing all scores for a category.

TABLE 11

FACULTY USES MADE BY WEIGHTED RANKINGS* OF WORD PROCESSORS BY WORD PROCESSOR TYPE

	Macintosh	IBM PC**	Apple II
Exams	357	117	5
Syllabi	267	130	3
Course Assignments	214	134	8
Lecture Notes	154	74	0
Research Papers	219	218	0
Department Reports	153	86	10
Proposals	120	73	1
Books	107	66	0
Other	47	20	10

*Weighted Ranks constructed by awarding 10, 8, 5, 3, and 1 points to Most Used, Next Most Used, . . . , 5th Most Used and summing all scores for a category.

**There are 17 Other Computers as compared to 31 IBM PCs.

TABLE 12

USE OF WORD PROCESSING CENTER BY FACULTY

Usage	Frequency	Percent
Heavily	1	.8
Moderately	10	7.8
Seldom	27	21.1
Never	90	70.3
	128	100.0

TABLE 13

USE OF TDP BY FACULTY

Usage	Frequency	Percent
Heavily	2	1.6
Moderately	8	6.3
Seldom	18	14.1
Never	100	78.1
	128	100.0

TABLE 14

NEW WORD PROCESSING SERVICES
NEEDED BY FACULTY

New Service Requested	Frequency*	Percent
Laser Printers	11	28.2
More Extensive Courses	4	10.3
Graphics Capability	4	10.3
Faculty Support	3	7.7
Proficient Technical Typist	2	5.1
Hardware & Software Support	2	5.1
	26	66.7

* Only Services requested by two or more are tabulated. There were 13 responses with frequency equal to one.

TABLE 15

ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS RESPONDING

Art
Biology
Chemistry
Communications
English
Environmental Studies
History
Mathematics
Music
Philosophy / Religion
Physics
Psychology
Theater & Speech
Anonymous Responses - Seven (7)

Accounting
Management
Computer Science
Criminal Justice
Human Services
Administration & Supervision
Curriculum & Instruction
Educ. Psy. & Special Ed.
Health, P.E. & Recreation
Human Ecology
Political Science
Sociology & Anthropology
University Honors

TABLE 16

NUMBERS OF ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS
THAT UTILIZE MICROCOMPUTERS

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	33	94.3
No	2	5.7
	1	Missing
	36	100.0

TABLE 17

NUMBERS OF ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS THAT
UTILIZE WORD PROCESSING ON MICROS

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	33	94.3
No	2	5.7
	1	Missing
Totals	36	100.0

TABLE 18

NUMBERS OF MICROS USED BY TYPE BY
ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT

	Macintosh	IBM PC	Apple IIe	HP150	Other
1	12	5	3	4	2
2	2	1	2	--	--
3	2	--	--	--	--
4	1	--	--	--	1
5	1	3	--	--	--
6	1	--	--	--	--
10 or more	1	2	1	--	--

TABLE 19

MACINTOSH USAGE BY DEPARTMENTS WITHIN COLLEGE OR SCHOOL BY NUMBERS OF UNITS

	Mac Units		
	1	2-6	6 Plus
Arts & Sciences	9	3	1
Engineering	1	--	--
Health / Human Services	1	1	--
Education	--	2	--
Totals	11	6	1

TABLE 20

IBM PC USAGE BY DEPARTMENTS WITHIN COLLEGE OR SCHOOL BY NUMBERS OF UNITS

	IBM PC Units		
	1	2-6	6 Plus
Arts & Sciences	1	--	--
Business Admin.	--	1	--
Engineering	1	--	--
Health /Human Services	--	--	2
Education	1	--	--
Totals	3	1	2

TABLE 21

WORD PROCESSING SOFTWARE PRIMARILY UTILIZED BY ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS -- RANKED

	Most Used	2nd Most Used	3rd Most Used
MacWrite	12	3	2
Multimate	7	1	--
MicroSoft Word	5	8	3
Word Star	4	1	1
Word Perfect	1	-	--
Microsoft Works	1	1	1
Apple Writer	1	2	--
Other *	2	2	1

* Zero responses for New York Word, Enable, & Display Write

TABLE 22

WORD PROCESSING SOFTWARE PRIMARILY UTILIZED
BY ACADEMIC DEPARMENTS BY PC TYPE

	Macintosh	IBM PC	Other
MacWrite	10	1*	1
MicrosoftWord	5	--	--
Word Perfect	--	--	1
Miltimate	--	4	3
Microsoft Works	1	--	--
Word Star	1	1	1
Total	17	6	6

* Reported incorrectly

TABLE 23

USE BY ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS OF WORD
PROCESSING CENTER SERVICES

	Frequency	Percent
Heavily	1	2.9
Moderately	9	25.7
Seldom	15	42.9
Never	10	28.6
No Answer	1	--
	36	100.0

TABLE 24

USE BY ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS OF
TDP ON HP 3000

	Frequency	Percent
Heavily	1	2.9
Moderately	8	23.5
Seldom	10	29.4
Never	15	44.1
No Answer	2	--
	36	100.0

TABLE 25

USES MADE BY RANK OF WORD PROCESSING
BY ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT

	Most Used	2nd Most Used	3rd Most Used	4th Most Used	5th Most Used
Syllabi	5	4	3	5	2
Exams	5	5	4	3	2
Course Assnmts.	--	4	2	1	4
Lecture Notes	--	--	--	2	--
Letters	8	4	4	1	1
Research Papers	4	4	2	--	3
Proposals	1	--	6	5	4
Books	1	5	--	--	--
Dept. Reports	3	2	5	4	2
Other	3	1	1	--	--

TABLE 26

USES MADE BY WEIGHTED RANKINGS* OF
WORD PROCESSORS BY ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS

	Weighted Rank
Exams	121
Syllabi	109
Course Assignments	49
Lecture Notes	6
Letters	136
Research Papers	85
Proposals	59
Books	50
Department Reports	75
Other	43

*Weighted Rankings are constructed by assigning 10, 8, 5, 3, and 1 points to Most Used, Next Most Used, etc., and summing all scores for a category.

TABLE 27

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENTS RESPONDING*

Academic Personnel
Administrative Affairs
Administration and Finance
Admissions
Adult Services Center
Advisement / Orientation
Archaeology
Arena
Athletics
Audit / Management Serivces
Broadcast Services
Budget / Personnel / Info. Mgmt.
Business Affairs
Business Services
Campus Stores
Center - Community Career Education
Center - Economic Education
Continuing Education
Cooperative Education
Development
Developmental Studies
Facilities Planning & Management
Financial Affairs
Financial Aid
Fine Arts Center
Food Services
Graduate Studies and Research
Grants and Research
Graphic Services
Health and Human Serivces
Health Services
Human Resources
Mail Service
Parking Services
Personnel
Placement
Records
Registration
Student Affairs
Undergraduate & Special
University Honors Program
University Relations
Year Center

* Several could not be identified.

TABLE 28

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENTS THAT
USE MICROCOMPUTERS

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	44	93.6
No	3	6.4
Totals	47	100.0

TABLE 29

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENTS THAT USE
WORD PROCESSING ON MICROCOMPUTERS

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	41	91.1
No	4	8.9
	2	Missing
Totals	45	100.0

TABLE 30

NUMBERS OF ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENTS
WITH MACINTOSH COMPUTERS

	Frequency
1	5
2	2
3	1
Total	8

TABLE 31

NUMBERS OF ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENTS
WITH IBM PCS

	Frequency
1	17
2	2
3	2
4	1
5	1
6	3
7	1
Total	27

TABLE 32

NUMBER OF ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENTS
WITH PCs NOT IBM NOR MACINTOSH

	Apple IIe	HP 150	Other
1	4	6	8
2	--	1	1

TABLE 33

SOFTWARE PRIMARILY USED FOR WORD PROCESSING
BY ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT

	Frequency	
	Most Used	Next Most Used
MacWrite	2	--
Microsoft Word	6	2
Word Perfect	6	1
Multimate	10	1
Microsoft Works	2	--
Apple Works	1	--
Word Star	8	1
Display Write	--	1
Other	1	2
Totals	36	8

TABLE 34

WORD PROCESSING SOFTWARE PRIMARILY
USED BY PC TYPE - ADMINISTRATIVE

	Macintosh	IBM PC	Other
MacWrite	2	1	--
Microsoft Word	1	1	3
Word Perfect	--	4	1
Multimate	--	9	--
Word Star	--	5	1
Other	--	1	--
Totals	3	21	5

TABLE 35

USE BY ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENTS OF WORD PROCESSING CENTER SERVICES (IF AVAILABLE)

	Frequency	Percent
Heavily	3	6.8
Moderately	9	20.5
Seldom	24	54.5
Never	8	18.2
Totals	44	100.0

TABLE 36

USE BY ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENTS OF TDP ON HP 3000s

	Frequency	Percent
Heavily	6	13.0
Moderately	4	8.7
Seldom	4	8.7
Never	32	79.6
Totals	46	100.0

TABLE 37

USES MADE BY RANK OF WORD PROCESSORS BY ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT

	Most Used	2nd Most Used	3rd Most Used	4th Most ...Used	5th Most Used
Letters	25	6	4	1	--
Reports	10	13	5	1	--
Proposals	2	9	5	3	3
Tables	2	--	6	3	1
Newsletters/Copy	2	1	5	4	1
Charts	1	--	3	3	2
Other	1	3	--	1	1

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A.1

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
AT CHATTANOOGA

Office of the Associate Provost for Budget,
Personnel & Information Management
109 Race Hall
615 McCallie Avenue
Chattanooga, TN 37403
(615) 755-4541

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Lloyd Davis

FROM: Richard Gray RG

SUBJECT: Word Processing Center - Evaluation and Recommendations

DATE: December 11, 1987

As a follow-up to our recent discussion, I would like for you to conduct an evaluation of UTC's Word Processing Center. Your evaluation should cover those specific items identified in the attached letter from John White, dated December 8, 1987.

In addition to the points raised by John, I would like your assessment of the Center's operating guidelines (see attachment). I would be particularly interested in your recommendations concerning the Center's current reliance on mainframe software support, the range and priority of support services provided, and the exclusion of administrative user support services.

Your efforts on this assignment should not interfere with your on-going efforts to develop a Disaster Recovery Plan for UTC's computer installations. I would hope that your schedule would enable the completion of the Word Processing assignment, culminating in a written report to me, by May 1, 1988.

I will, of course, be pleased to provide clarification of this request and to assist you in any way that I can.

Attachment

xc: Marvin Ernst
John White
Sandra Packard

APPENDIX A.2

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
AT CHATTANOOGA

Office of Grants & Research
218 Race Hall
615 McCallie Avenue
Chattanooga, TN 37403
(615) 755-4431

December 8, 1987

Dr. Richard Gray
Associate Provost, Budget, Personnel
and Information Management
UTC

Dear Dr. Gray:

Thank you very much for meeting with Dr. Ernst and me to discuss plans to improve the effectiveness of the Word Processing Center. I appreciate your interest and the continued support of the Center by Lloyd Davis and the staff of CECA.

As a follow-up to our discussion, I have enclosed the Word Processing Center Guidelines. This document defines the purpose and work categories of this office. In addition, I am including a summary of today's conversation for your review:

INTRODUCTION

There are many faculty and departmental computers on campus which are not compatible with Hewlett Packard hardware and software. This means that documents cannot be returned to faculty on floppy discs or transferred to their computers for their revision; we must store documents on the mainframe for infinity when, in some cases, a test or course syllabi may require a single word change each year. Of course, this puts demands on our limited storage space and the faculty member is placed on a priority list and must wait for very minor revisions.

RESPONSE

Dr. Gray has suggested that Lloyd Davis conduct an assessment of the Center between January 4 and May 1, 1988. Possible Objectives of the assessment are as follows:

a. Identify what kinds and numbers of personal computers are on campus

b. Identify computer hardware and software which can be compatible to and accessed by most faculty personal computers

c. Prepare a list of equipment and/or software which will increase the effectiveness of the Word Processing Center.

John White will, in turn, prepare a 5 year plan for equipment/ software acquisition and enhancement of the Center. The plan will be based on the recommendations of Dr. Davis.

SUMMARY

Hopefully, the proposed project can serve as a model for other universities of our size, and the results of our efforts can be disseminated through professional journals and presentations.

In closing, let me thank you again for meeting with us today.

Sincerely,

John White

cc: Connie Looney
Mary Lee Cleveland
Dr. Marvin Ernst
Dr. Lloyd Davis

enclosures

GUIDELINES

WORD PROCESSING CENTER

113 RACE HALL

PURPOSE: The Center exists to serve the academic area for special word processing needs as an extension of the typing services normally provided by the departmental secretaries.

WORK CATEGORIES: The Center provides support services in the following categories: Grant Proposals, Tests, Course Syllabi, Class Handouts, Manuscripts (books, articles, papers, and monographs), and Other (reports, vitae, letters, and surveys). The processing of documents outside the categories listed above will be done only upon the approval of the Associate Provost for Graduate Studies and Research.

CHARGE: The Center is considered an academic support unit; therefore, no fee will be charged to the individual faculty member or the academic department using the service.

PRINTERS/STYLE OF PRINT: The Center uses a Diablo printer with a Titan 10 printwheel for printing documents. The Titan 10 corresponds to an IBM Courier 72 10-pitch element. At the user's request, a document may also be printed using a Prestige Elite or Letter Gothic 12-pitch element. The Diablo at this time is unable to print any characters not ordinarily found on a standard typewriter keyboard (i.e., Greek letters and other foreign languages, mathematical symbols, italics, etc.). However, the center has access to the HP2680 and is in the process of purchasing a Laser Jet Plus Printer. These printers are equipped with features such as bold or italic characters, foreign language symbols, subscripts, superscripts, and graphics.

PROCEDURE:

Step 1. Faculty member must submit document to Center (retaining copy for your files), and fill out a Request for Service form.

Step 2. Word Processing Specialist enters document into the computer exactly as it has been submitted.(PLEASE BE SPECIFIC: margins, spacing, 10/12 pitch, page numbering, etc.)

Step 3. A draft of the document is printed for proofing and editing.

Step 4. Faculty member picks up draft, edits it using red ink, circles line numbers on which changes appear, and returns edited draft to the Center.

Step 5. Corrections are entered into the computer and a draft printed indicating the changes made in the document.

Step 6. Steps 3-5 are repeated until the document is ready for a final printing - usually, three drafts are sufficient. (Please retain copy of last numbered draft, along with copy of "Request for Service" form, in your files for possible changes at a later date - changes must be noted on a numbered draft.)

Step 7. One final copy is printed on the faculty member's choice of paper (i.e., bond or typing paper furnished by the Center or letterhead furnished by the user).

Step 8. Final copy is picked up at the Center.

Step 9. At the close of each semester, The faculty member will have the option to continue storage of the document for a second semester. The center will eliminate those files which are being stored that are no longer needed.

STORAGE POLICY: If storage is needed for more than one year, persons who utilize the Hewlett Packard on campus or whose computer is compatible with the TDP program used at the center will be given the option of having documents transferred to their own accounts rather than having them purged. Persons without these capabilities will be notified after one year of storage prior to purging the document. If necessary, arrangements may be made through Academic Computing to store the document on tape.

WHEN A FILE IS SENT TO AN INDIVIDUAL'S ACCOUNT, THE CENTER WILL KEEP A COPY OF THE FILE FOR ONE MONTH BEFORE PURGING.

LEGIBILITY: All material submitted must be legible to the Word Processing Specialist.

PRIORITY OF DOCUMENTS:**

New Documents and Revisions of more than 10 lines on Existing Files

1. *Grant Proposals
2. Tests
3. Course Syllabi

4. Class Handouts
5. Manuscripts (books, articles, papers, and monographs)
6. Other (vitae, letters, reports, etc., are done only as scheduling time permits)

*If more than one grant proposal is being processed at the same time, the proposal having the earliest deadline will receive top priority.

Revisions of less than 10 lines on existing files will be made as soon as possible.

**Changes in the above priority guidelines may be made by the Center's supervisor whenever he/she deems it necessary.

LEAD TIME: The following lead times are suggested for each category of document.

1.	Grant Proposals	2 working days for each 10 pages of text
2.	Tests	3 working days for each 10 pages of text
3.	Course Syllabi	4 working days for each 10 pages of text
4.	Class Handouts	5 working days for each 10 pages of text
5.	Manuscripts	8 working days for each 10 pages of text
6.	Other	Estimate of turnaround time will be given when document is submitted.

USE OF DIABLO ONLY: Faculty members may request use of the Diablo to print documents which they have already entered in the computer; however, the Center's supervisor will determine when the Diablo is available for such use based on the needs of the Word Processing Center. The Center will have top priority.

COMPUTER RELIABILITY: The Word Processing Center uses the TDP Program of the campus computer, Hewlett-Packard Series 58. Although every effort will be made to meet deadlines, some situations (such as computer down time) may arise which are beyond the control of the Center.

9/86

Center of Excellence for Computer Applications (CCI) February 10, 1988

FACULTY WORD PROCESSING SURVEY

My Department/College/School is _____

1. I have a microcomputer for my personal use. _____yes _____no

2. I use word processing on my personal computer. _____yes_____no

   If the answer to 1 or 2 is yes, answer question 3; otherwise, skip to 4.

3. The personal computer I primarily use is:
   _____Macintosh
   _____IBM PC
   _____Apple IIe
   _____HP 150
   _____HP Vectra
   _____Other. (Please specify)_____

   The microcomputer word processor our I primarily use is: (If more than one, rank order them 1, 2, 3. . . with 1 being most heavy.)

   _____MacWrite
   _____MicrosoftWord
   _____Word Perfect
   _____Multimate
   _____Microsoft Works
   _____New York Word
   _____Apple Works
   _____Word Star
   _____Enable
   _____Apple Writer
   _____Display Write
   _____Other. (Please specify)_____

   If you use other micros or word processors, name and briefly describe them: _____
   _____

4. I utilize the Word Processing Center (113 Race) services:
   _____never
   _____seldom
   _____moderately
   _____heavily

5. I utilize TDP (word processor) on the HP3000s:
   _____never
   _____seldom
   _____moderately
   _____heavily

6. When our unit uses word processing packages, either micro versions or TDP/3000, it usethem for the following applications: (Please rank order the top three to five, where 1 = most used application, 2 = next most used, etc.)

   _____Exams
   _____Course assignments
   _____Lecture notes
   _____Syllabi
   _____Research papers
   _____Proposals
   _____Books
   _____Departmental reports
   _____Other. Specify _____

7. What new services, not currently supplied by the Word Processing Center, would you suggest adding?_____
   _____

8. Comments: Please feel free to identify your future needs or add comments that you feel are appropriate._____
   _____

Return to : Lloyd Davis, CECA, 413 Hunter Hall by February 29, 1988.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
AT CHATTANOOGA

Center of Excellence
for Computer Applications
413 Hunter Hall
615 McCallie Avenue
Chattanooga, TN 37403
(615) 755-4396

DATE: February 10, 1988

TO: All UTC Faculty

FROM: Lloyd Davis LD

RE: Faculty Word Processing

During the past four years, many of the faculty have purchased their own microcomputers. There has been a dramatic increase in the use of word processing by our faculty. In fact, the most popular microcomputer application used by the faculty appears to be word processing.

I have been requested by Dr. Gray to evaluate our word processing capabilities and make recommendations to him in several areas including what new services, if any, should be provided to our faculty in the area of word processing.

As an early step in this study, I am requesting you to complete the attached survey and return it to me by February 29. This survey is to measure faculty usage in word processing on a microcomputer, either the property of the individual or the institution. The survey is one page long and should take only a few minutes to complete. The surveys do not request your name and will remain anonymous. I will make the compiled results available to the university community at a later date.

If I can provide further information, please contact me at 4387. Thank you, in advance, for your assistance.

Attachment

cc: Dr. Marvin Ernst
Dr. Richard Gray
Dr. Sandra Packard
Mr. John White

Center of Excellence for Computer Applications (CCI) February 10, 1988

ACADEMIC WORD PROCESSING SURVEY

My Department/College/School is _____

1. Our academic unit has a microcomputer(s). _____yes _____no

2. Our academic unit uses word processing on these microcomputers. _____yes_____no

   If the answer to 1 or 2 is yes, answer question 3; otherwise, skip to 4.

3. The numbers of microcomputers by type that my academic unit has purchased and uses are:
   _____Macintosh
   _____IBM PC
   _____Apple IIe
   _____HP 150
   _____HP Vectra
   _____Other. (Please specify)_____

   The microcomputer word processor our academic unit primarily uses is: (If more than one, rank order them 1, 2, 3. . . with 1 being most heavy.)

   _____MacWrite
   _____MicrosoftWord
   _____Word Perfect
   _____Multimate
   _____Microsoft Works
   _____New York Word
   _____Apple Works
   _____Word Star
   _____Enable
   _____Apple Writer
   _____Display Write
   _____Other. (Please specify)_____

   If you use other micros or word processors, name and briefly describe them: _____
   _____

4. Our academic unit utilizes the Word Processing Center (113 Race) services:
   _____never
   _____seldom
   _____moderately
   _____heavily

5. Our academic unit utilizes TDP (word processor) on the HP3000s:
   _____never
   _____seldom
   _____moderately
   _____heavily

6. When our unit uses word processing packages, either micro versions or TDP/3000, it usethem for the following applications: (Please rank order the top three to five, where 1 = most used application, 2 = next most used, etc.)

   _____Exams
   _____Course assignments
   _____Lecture notes
   _____Syllabi
   _____Letters
   _____Research papers
   _____Proposals
   _____Books
   _____Departmental reports
   _____Other. Specify _____

7. What new services, not currently supplied by the Word Processing Center, would you suggest adding?_____
   _____

8. Comments: Please feel free to identify your future needs or add comments that you feel are appropriate._____
   _____

Return to : Lloyd Davis, CECA, 413 Hunter Hall by February 29, 1988.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
AT CHATTANOOGA

Center of Excellence
for Computer Applications
413 Hunter Hall
615 McCallie Avenue
Chattanooga, TN 37403
(615) 755-4396

DATE: February 10, 1988

TO: Academic Deans and Department Heads

FROM: Lloyd Davis LD

RE: Academic Word Processing

During the past four years, many of the faculty have purchased a personal microcomputer. The most popular microcomputer application used by the faculty appears to be word processing. Your unit probably is one that has purchased microcomputers.

I have been requested by Dr. Gray to evaluate our word processing capabilities and make recommendations to him in several areas including what new services, if any, should be provided to our faculty in the area of word processing.

As an early step in this study, I am requesting you to complete the attached survey and return it to me by February 29. This survey deals only with microcomputers purchased in your unit for use by staff or faculty. The survey is one page long and should take only a few minutes to complete. I will make the compiled results available to the university community at a later date.

If I can provide further information, please contact me at 4387. Thank you, in advance, for your assistance.

Attachment

cc: Dr. Marvin Ernst
Dr. Richard Gray
Dr. Sandra Packard
Mr. John White

APPENDIX B.3

Center of Excellence for Computer Applications (CCI) February 10, 1988

ADMINISTRATIVE WORD PROCESSING SURVEY

My Administrative unit is _____

1. Our administrative unit has a microcomputer(s). _____yes _____no

2. Our administrative unit uses word processing on these microcomputers. _____yes_____no

   If the answer to 1 or 2 is yes, answer question 3; otherwise, skip to 4.

3. The numbers of microcomputers by type that my administrative unit uses are:
   _____Macintosh
   _____IBM PC
   _____Apple IIe
   _____HP 150
   _____HP Vectra
   _____Other. (Please specify)_____

   The microcomputer word processor our administrative unit primarily uses is: (If more than one, rank order them 1, 2, 3. . . with 1 being most heavy.)

_____MacWrite	_____Apple Works
_____MicrosoftWord	_____Word Star
_____Word Perfect	_____Enable
_____Multimate	_____Apple Writer
_____Microsoft Works	_____Display Write
_____New York Word	_____Other. (Please specify)_____

4. Our administrative unit would utilize (if it were available) the Word Processing Center (113 Race) services:

_____never	_____moderately
_____seldom	_____heavily

5. Our administrative unit utilizes TDP (word processor) on the HP3000s:

_____never	_____moderately
_____seldom	_____heavily

6. When our unit uses word processing packages, either micro versions or TDP/3000, it usethem for the following applications: (Please rank order the top three to five, where 1 = most used application, 2 = next most used, etc.)

_____Letters	_____Tables
_____Reports	_____Newsletter/Copy material
_____Lecture notes	_____Charts
_____Proposals	_____Other. Specify _____

7. What new services, not currently supplied by the Word Processing Center, would you suggest adding?_____
   _____

8. Comments: Please feel free to identify your future needs or add comments that you feel are appropriate._____
   _____

Return to : Lloyd Davis, CECA, 413 Hunter Hall by February 29, 1988.

DATE: February 10, 1988

TO: All Administrative Officers

FROM: Lloyd Davis

RE: Administrative Word Processing

During the past four years, many, if not all, administrative officers have added microcomputers to their offices. The purposes for which they are used are primarily for spreadsheets and word processing.

I have been requested by Dr. Gray to evaluate our word processing capabilities and make recommendations to him in several areas including what new services, if any, should be provided to our faculty in the area of word processing. Although currently most administrative users do their own word processing, I would like input as to your unit's needs.

As an early step in this study, I am requesting you to complete the attached survey and return it to me by February 29. This survey covers microcomputers used by your unit. The survey is one page long and should take only a few minutes to complete. I will make the compiled results available to the university community at a later date.

If I can provide further information, please contact me at 4387. Thank you, in advance, for your assistance.

Attachment

cc: Dr. Marvin Ernst
Dr. Richard Gray
Dr. Sandra Packard
Mr. John White

GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES

WORD PROCESSING CENTER

113 RACE HALL

755-4052

PURPOSE: The Center exists to serve the **academic area (faculty)** for special word processing needs as an extension of the typing services normally provided by the departmental secretaries.

WORK CATEGORIES: The Center provides support services in the following categories: **Grant Proposals, Tests, Course Syllabi, Class Handouts, Manuscripts (books, articles, papers, and monographs), and Other (reports, vitae, letters, and surveys).** The processing of documents outside the categories listed above will be done only upon the approval of the Associate Provost for Graduate Studies and Research.

CHARGE: The Center is considered an academic support unit; therefore, **no fee will be charged to the individual faculty member or the academic department using the service.**

PRINTERS/STYLE OF PRINT: The Center houses a **Hewlett Packard LaserJet (2688) printer.** This printer is equipped with features such as bold and italic characters and subscripts and superscripts. It can print gothic 12 pitch, courier 10 pitch, elite 12 pitch and proportional typeface.

The Center can access the **HP2680 Laser Printer** located in Hunter which is equipped with features such as bold or italic characters, foreign language symbols, subscripts, superscripts, and graphics.

The Center also has a **Diablo 1650 Printer** with several printwheels for printing documents. The Titan 10 corresponds to an IBM Courier 72 10-pitch element. It also prints with Prestige Elite or Letter Gothic 12-pitch printwheels, both of which correspond to IBM typing elements. The Diablo at this time is unable to print any characters not ordinarily found on a standard typewriter keyboard (i.e., Greek letters and other foreign languages, mathematical symbols, italics, etc.).

- PROCEDURES - next 2 pages

PROCEDURE:

Step 1. **Faculty member must submit document to Center** (retaining copy for your files), and fill out a Request for Service form.

Step 2. Word Processing Specialist enters document into the computer exactly as it has been submitted. **(PLEASE BE SPECIFIC: margins, spacing, 10/12 pitch, page numbering, etc.)**

Step 3. A draft of the document is printed for proofing and editing.

Step 4. Faculty member picks up draft, edits it using red ink, circles line numbers on which changes appear, and returns edited draft to the Center.

Step 5. Corrections are entered into the computer and a draft printed indicating the changes made in the document.

Step 6. Steps 3-5 are repeated until the document is ready for a final printing - usually, three drafts are sufficient. **(Please retain copy of last numbered draft, along with copy of "Request for Service" form, in your files for possible changes at a later date - changes must be noted on a numbered draft.)**

Step 7. One final copy is printed on the faculty member's choice of paper (i.e., bond or typing paper furnished by the Center or letterhead furnished by the user).

Step 8. Final copy is picked up at the Center.

Step 9. At the close of each semester, the faculty member will have the option to continue storage of the document for a second semester. This is necessary in order to eliminate files that are no longer needed to provide space for new projects.

STORAGE POLICY: If storage is needed on an **inactive** file for more than one year, persons who utilize the Hewlett Packard on campus or whose computer is compatible with the TDP program used at the Center will be given the option of having documents transferred to their own accounts rather than having them purged. These can still be accessed by the Word Processing Center and worked on at any time by Word Processing Specialists. Personal accounts may be obtained by contacting Ms. Beth Craig in Academic Computing, 413-B Hunter Hall. Persons without these capabilities will be notified after one year of storage prior to purging the document. If necessary, arrangements may be made through Academic Computing to store the document on tape.

WHEN A FILE IS SENT TO AN INDIVIDUAL'S ACCOUNT, THE CENTER WILL KEEP A COPY OF THE FILE FOR ONE MONTH BEFORE PURGING FROM WORD PROCESSING ACCOUNT.

LEGIBILITY: All material submitted must be legible to the Word Processing Specialist.

PRIORITY OF DOCUMENTS:**

New Documents and Revisions of more than 10 lines on Existing Files

1. *Grant Proposals
2. Tests
3. Course Syllabi
4. Class Handouts
5. Manuscripts (books, articles, papers, and monographs)
6. Other (vitae, letters, reports, etc., are done only as scheduling time permits)

*If more than one grant proposal is being processed at the same time, the proposal having the earliest deadline will receive top priority.

Revisions of less than 10 lines on existing files will be made as soon as possible.

****Changes in the above priority guidelines may be made by the Center's supervisor whenever he/she deems it necessary.**

LEAD TIME

The following lead times are suggested for each category of document, however, please do not hesitate to contact the Word Processing Center for an estimated turnaround time for your project, as we may be able to adjust our present workload to meet your deadline need.

1.	Grant Proposals	2 working days for each 10 pages of text
2.	Tests	3 working days for each 10 pages of text
3.	Course Syllabi	4 working days for each 10 pages of text
4.	Class Handouts	5 working days for each 10 pages of text
5.	Manuscripts	8 working days for each 10 pages of text
6.	Other	Estimate of turnaround time will be given when document is submitted.

COMPUTER RELIABILITY: The Word Processing Center uses the TDP Program of the campus computer, Hewlett-Packard Series 58. Although every effort will be made to meet deadlines, some situations (such as computer down time) may arise which are beyond the control of the Center.

Please feel free to call us at 755-4052 anytime you have a question pertaining to the Center as it relates to your typing needs (such as deadline needs or typeface requirements, etc.) We will try to work with each faculty member in any way possible to meet his/her needs and deadlines.

1/88

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: John White

FROM: Word Processing Center

SUBJECT: Monthly Report - February, 1988

DATE: February 25, 1988

Listed below are the documents that are currently in progress in the Word Processing Center. In addition to these documents, there are 400 other manuscripts, books, test, syllabi, vitae, etc. that may require editing at a later date. The Center requires an estimate turnaround time of two weeks, (estimate of turnaround time will be given when document is submitted) and encourages all users to submit documents legibly and in order. (Documents are entered into the computer exactly as they are submitted.)

DOCUMENT	PROFESSOR	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	PAGES
Book	Dr. R. Jackson	English	Edit	500++
"	" (Jac5)	"	Input	7
"	" (Jac6)	"	Input	9
"	" (Jac7)	"	Input	7
Vita	Dr. Barrow	English	Edit	7***
Syllabi	Dr. Barrow(30)	English	Draft	5
Syllabi	Dr. Barrow(31)	English	Draft	6
List	Dr. Barrow(Alpha)	English	Redo	4**(2)
List	" (Alpha1)	"	Input	1*(2)
Memo	" (Alphameo)	"	Input	1*
List	" (Alpha2)	"	Input	1*
Book	Dr. Kileff(50)	Sociology	Edit	20
"	"(Kilc52)	"	Input	12
"	"(Kilc52a)	"	Input	7
"	"(Kilc53)	"	Input	19
"	"(Kilc54)	"	Input	8
"	"(Kilc55)	"	Input	5
Vita	Dr. Kileff	Sociology	Edit	7

DOCUMENT	PROFESSOR	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	PAGES
Book	Dr. Rabin(Rch7r)	Economics	Rewrite	75***(2)
Book	Dr. Renee Cox(53)	Music	Edit	20
"	Dr. Renee Cox(54)	Music	Edit	26
"	Dr. Renee Cox(56)	Music	Edit	15
"	Dr. Renee Cox(57)	Music	Edit	20
"	Dr. Renee Cox(58)	Music	Edit	5
"	Dr. Renee Cox(59)	Music	Edit	2
Paper	Dr. Renee Cox(63)	Music	Input	25*
Article	Dr. Gavin	SOBA-A/F	Draft	18
Article	Dr. Gavin	SOBA-A/F	Draft	26
Article	Dr. Gavin	SOBA-A/F	Draft	12
Vita	Dr. Marsh(50)	Cont. Ed.	Edit	11**
Paper	Dr. Marsh(60a)	Cont. Ed.	Edit	7**(2)
Article	Dr. Harston(50)	Comp. Sci.	Draft	8
Paper	Dr. Noe(Marn31)	English	Edit	3
Letters	Dr. Noe(Noem61)	English	Input	12*(2)
Letters	Dr. Noe(Noem62)	English	Input	12*(2)
Book	Dr. Carrithers(51a)	Pol. Sci.	Edit	26
"	Dr. Carrithers(51)	Pol. Sci.	Edit	12
"	Dr. Carrithers(53)	Pol. Sci.	Edit	40
"	Dr. Carrithers(55a)	Pol. Sci.	Input	3
"	Dr. Carrithers(55)	Pol. Sci.	Input	10
"	Dr. Carrithers(56)	Pol. Sci.	Input	7
Self Study	Dr. Tanner	Home Ec.	Input/Edit	171
Syllabi	Dr. Tanner	Home Ec.	Input	125+
Proposal	Dr. Ron Cox(Eng/Mgmt)	Engnr.	Redo	50**
Vita	Dr. Ernst(60)	Assoc. Prov.	Input	14**(3)
Vita	Dr. Ernst(60b)	Assoc.Prov.	Input	2*
Addresses (Labels)	Dr. C. Reagan(60,61)	Marketing	Input	300
Poems	Dr. Richards(65/102)	English	Input	55
Handout	Dr. T. Ware(40)	English	Redo	9**

DOCUMENT	PROFESSOR	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	PAGES
Paper	Dr. Wright	History	Input	37
Paper	Dr. Kleiman(60,abc)	Mgmt/BA	Input	50*(2)
Vita	Dr. Sanderlin(62)	English	Redo	14**(2)
Paper	Dr. V. Prevost(51)	English	Input	10*
Printing	Dr. Wilson(Mac)	Pol. Sci.	Printing	116+*
"	"	"	"	90+*
"	"	"	"	150+*
"	"	"	"	*
"	"	"	"	*
"	"	"	"	50+*

(Word Processing Specialist spent a total of 13 hours in computer lab in Hunter Hall, running final copies on MacIntosh.)
(Dr. Rick Wilson's research.)

Vita	Dr. James(61)	Psychology	Input	6*(3)
Syllabi	Dr. James(30)	Psychology	Input	3*(2)
Paper	Dr. Snyder(50)	Marketing	Input	13*

The Word Processing Center report reflects the work done the previous month with the cutoff date being the first of every month.

* New Material
** Existing files updated during February
*** Continued from previous month

(#) Represents number of times paper was brought in during month.

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: John White

FROM: Word Processing Center

SUBJECT: Monthly Report - March, 1988

DATE: April 10, 1988

Listed below are the documents that are currently in progress in the Word Processing Center. In addition to these documents, there are 400 other manuscripts, books, test, syllabi, vitae, etc. that may require editing at a later date. The Center requires an estimate turnaround time of two weeks, (estimate of turnaround time will be given when document is submitted) and encourages all users to submit documents legibly and in order. (Documents are entered into the computer exactly as they are submitted.)

DOCUMENT	PROFESSOR	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	PAGES
Book	Dr. R. Jackson	English	Edit	500++
"	" (Jac5)	"	Input	7
"	" (Jac6)	"	Input	9
"	" (Jac7)	"	Input	7
Vita	Dr. Barrow(1)	English	Edit	7**
Syllabi	Dr. Barrow(30)	English	Draft	5
Syllabi	Dr. Barrow(31)	English	Draft	6
List	Dr. Barrow(Alpha)	English	Redo	4**(2)
List	" (Alpha1)	"	Input	1**
List	" (Alpha2)	"	Input	1**
List	" (Alpha3)	"	Input	2*
Book	Dr. Kileff(50)	Sociology	Edit	20
"	"(Kilc52)	"	Input	12
"	"(Kilc52a)	"	Input	7
"	"(Kilc53)	"	Input	19
"	"(Kilc54)	"	Input	8
"	"(Kilc55)	"	Input	5

DOCUMENT	PROFESSOR	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	PAGES
Book	Dr. Rabin(Rch7r)	Economics	Rewrite	75
Book	Dr. Renee Cox(53)	Music	Edit	20
"	Dr. Renee Cox(54)	Music	Edit	26
"	Dr. Renee Cox(56)	Music	Edit	15
"	Dr. Renee Cox(57)	Music	Edit	20
"	Dr. Renee Cox(58)	Music	Edit	5
"	Dr. Renee Cox(59)	Music	Edit	2
Paper	Dr. Renee Cox(63,a)	Music	Input	25**(3)
Article	Dr. Gavin	SOBA-A/F	Draft	18
Article	Dr. Gavin	SOBA-A/F	Draft	26
Article	Dr. Gavin	SOBA-A/F	Draft	12
Vita	Dr. Marsh(50)	Cont. Ed.	Edit	11
Paper	Dr. Marsh(60a)	Cont. Ed.	Edit	7
Letter	Dr. Marsh(62)	Cont. Ed.	Input	2*
Abstract	Dr. Marsh(63)	Cont. Ed.	Input	1*
Article	Dr. Harston(50)	Comp. Sci.	Draft	8
Paper	Dr. Noe(Marn31)	English	Edit	3
Letters	Dr. Noe(Noem61)	English	Input	12
Letters	Dr. Noe(Noem62)	English	Input	12
Book	Dr. Carrithers(51a)	Pol. Sci.	Edit	26
"	Dr. Carrithers(51)	Pol. Sci.	Edit	12
"	Dr. Carrithers(53)	Pol. Sci.	Edit	40
"	Dr. Carrithers(55a)	Pol. Sci.	Input	3
"	Dr. Carrithers(55)	Pol. Sci.	Input	10
"	Dr. Carrithers(56)	Pol. Sci.	Input	7
Self Study	Dr. Tanner	Home Ec.	Input/Edit	171
Syllabi	Dr. Tanner	Home Ec.	Input	125+
Test	Dr. Tanner(20)	Home Ecol.	Input	47*
Proposal	Dr. Ron Cox(Eng/Mgmt)	Engnr.	Redo	50**
Vita	Dr. Ernst(60)	Assoc. Prov.	Input	14
Vita	Dr. Ernst(60b)	Assoc.Prov.	Input	2

DOCUMENT	PROFESSOR	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	PAGES
Addresses (Labels)	Dr. C. Reagan(60,61)	Marketing	Input	300
Poems	Dr. Richards(65/102)	English	Input	55
Handout	Dr. T. Ware(40)	English	Redo	9
Paper	Dr. Wright	History	Input	37
Paper	Dr. Kleiman(60,abc)	Mgmt/BA	Input	50
Vita	Dr. Sanderlin(62)	English	Redo	14
Paper	Dr. V. Prevost(51,a)	English	Input	10**(2)
Vita	Dr. James(61)	Psychology	Input	6
Syllabi	Dr. James(30)	Psychology	Input	3
Syllabi	Dr. James(31)	Psychology	Input	2*
Paper	Dr. Snyder(50)	Marketing	Input	16**(4)
Minutes	Dr. Ligon(62 a-j)	Spec. Ed.	Input	18*
Article	Dr. Ligon(50)	Spec. Ed.	Input	10*
Vita	Dr. Pam Reid(60)	Psychology	Redo	11**
Article	Dr. Murgai	Library	Input	20*
Self Study	D. Williams(Doc,1/4)	Social Work	Input	90*(4)
Letters	Dr. Fox	Admissions	Input	31*(3)
Speech	D. Williams(50,b)	Social Work	Input	12*
Book	Dr. Campa	For. Lang.	Uncrunch	80**

The Word Processing Center report reflects the work done the previous month with the cutoff date being the first of every month.

* New Material
** Existing files updated during March
*** Continued from previous month

(#) Represents number of times paper was brought in during month.

APPENDIX C.4

WORD PROCESSING CENTER WORK BY YEAR

YEAR	GRANTS	BOOKS	MANUSCRIPTS	CLASSROOM & LAB. MATERIALS	MISCELLANEOUS & ADM.
1981	(Opened 9-1-81)		1	1	Univ. Budget (ADM.) 1 letter 1 vita 1 report
1982	12	2	18	50	Letters Dr. Obear (ADM.) (700) Letters (ADM.) (200) 3 Vita's
1983	5	2	40	6	2 papers (ADM.) 8 vita's
1984	6	4	14	5	7 vita's
1985	4	5	17	16	1 legal paper (ADM.) 2 papers (ADM.) Equipment UTC (ADM.)
1986	9	3	14	51	Equipment UTC (ADM.) 1 legal paper 4 vita's 295 letters (ADM.) 5 memos (ADM.)
1987	2	6	27	34	Faculty Book (ADM.) 1 letter 1 memo (ADM.) Fac. & Inf. Book (ADM.) 300 Address Labels 24 letters 24 letters

This report reflects only the number of items received in center for processing and does not reflect the length of projects nor time involved in input and editing.